

# CATHOLIC DISCUSSION.

## RAFFERTY'S LETTER. NO. 1.

WRENSHILL August 30, 1847

MESSRS. STRANG, AND PAGE

CHRISTIAN. In looking over the Revue of the 6th of June (July 8th) I discovered a challenge to the christian world, especially to the ministers of the different denominations. But, Sirs, as I am neither minister nor prophet, but a common layman and an earnest inquirer after truth, I would respectfully propose to your consideration a few serious questions in a spirit of charity. Sirs,—You admit to take the Bible as the standard of truth in points of doctrine, and standard historic works in points of fact.

The church was edified (that is, established,) walking in the fear of the Lord, and was filled with the consolation of the Holy Ghost (Acts 13:21. Acts 9:31.)

Having received the Holy Ghost, the Apostles boldly ventured to announce the resurrection of Christ to the people of Jerusalem, whom they astonished by their miracles. The effect of St. Peter's first sermon was the conversion of three, that of his second of five thousand souls.

The number of the faithful daily augmented, while these same proselytes, regenerated by baptism and renewed by the spirit of God, presented to the world a spectacle of the most disinterested and perfect virtue. The Apostles afterwards preached the word of God with like success throughout Judea, Galilee and Samaria.—From thence they passed into Syria and Asia Minor into Macedonia and Greece, every where publishing the gospel, that is to say, the happy news of man's redemption by

the death of Jesus Christ—St. Peter carried the faith to Rome at that time the seat of empire and the capital of the world. Out of this variety of nations, so different in manners and habits, was, in a short time, formed a new people—a society of men—united together by the profession of the same faith—by the perpetuation of the same sacraments, and by the communication of the same spiritual treasures—having the same invisible head, Jesus Christ, and the same visible head, St. Peter, first Pope and bishop of Rome.

This society or body is called the church of Christ, which was formed and established in defiance of every obstacle. The Jews opposed the gospel with inveterate obstinacy; and persecuted with rage the disciples of Jesus Christ. The heathens, on the other side, were eager to suppress it. The most distinguished among them, from the beginning, declared themselves its enemies. But in spite of the fury of the Jews and the opposition of the heathens, in spite of the power of the Emperors, and the still stronger influence of corruption, and prejudice, the Apostles established the church of Christ in all the countries of the universe, and sealed with their blood the truths they taught. Those whom they had chosen to succeed them in the functions of their ministry imitated their zeal, and, in like manner, transmitted to their successors the faith entrusted to them, which, by these means, has from age to age been handed down to our days in its original purity. This, Sirs, is the short declaration of the hope which is in us through the faith established by Christ and his Apostles. And now, Sirs, it is not you and I

that are at issue, but Jesus Christ and you.

To St. Peter alone our blessed Savior said, Thou art Peter, (a rock,) and upon this rock I will build my church, &c. Matt. xvi. 18.

To St. Peter alone our blessed Savior said, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, &c.

To Peter alone our blessed Savior said, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren. Luke xxii. 32. [Luke xxii. 32.]

To Peter our blessed Savior proposed three times the following questions: Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? John xxi. 15, 16, 17; and upon Peter's answer in the affirmative, he tells him twice feed my lambs, and the third time feed my sheep.

Now, Sirs, whose testimony are we to rely upon in the nineteenth century? Jesus Christ and his Apostles, or that of Messrs. Strang and Pogo, who affirm that the Apostolic church is extinct.

And again, Sirs, here you must observe that orders and mission or jurisdiction are two different things; orders only qualifies a man and makes him a bishop or a priest; but a mission or jurisdiction gives him leave and power to make use of the orders which he has received, and without which mission no bishop or priest can lawfully and validly exercise over others that power which they may possess. So necessary is a lawful mission that Christ declares, that he himself was sent by his father, and he hath sent me. John xii. 20 [John viii. 16.] And he gave me a commandment what I should say and what I should do. John xii. 19. [John xii. 49.]

And addressing his Apostles he says, As my father has sent me, even so I send you. John xx. 21. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations. Matt. xxix. 19 [Matt. xviii. 19.] In like manner

the Apostles sent others to succeed them with the power also to send others after them. As St. Paul and Barnabas was sent by the pastors of the church to Antioch, and their doing so was declared to be the work of the Holy Ghost, they sent them away. So they being sent by the Holy Ghost, went into Seleucia. Acts xiii. 3. [Acts xiii. 4.] St. Paul sent Titus, and speaking of the Apostles, he says, How can they preach unless they be sent? Rom. x. 15. St. Clement, whose name is written in the book of life, Phil. iv. 3, says that Christ Jesus received his mission from God, the apostles received their mission from Christ, and after having received the Holy Ghost and preached the gospel they established bishops and deacons, to whom they communicated the charge which they themselves had received from God.

They established a rule of succession for futurity, in order that in each age, at the death of its pastors, their office and ministry might be regularly handed down to others. This, then, is the door by which the true pastors of Christ's flock must enter, that is, they must be lawfully ordained and sent by the lawful pastors of the church, who have received valid orders and lawful jurisdiction from the lawful successors of the Apostles of Christ, for all who take the priestly office upon themselves without entering by this door are declared by Christ himself to be thieves and robbers. And again, you boast of having drawn into your church two hundred thousand in the short space of seventeen years, and those from the different churches of America and Great Britain. Now, pray, let us know how many Catholics from both or either country you have converted by your doctrine. And, again, I will give you a short sketch of the countries where Catholicity is prevalent, should you think it practicable to try to convert them.

The Catholic religion is the established of the several States of Italy, of most of the Swiss Cantons, of Piedmont, of France, of Spain, of Portugal, and of the Islands in the Mediterranean, of three parts in the four of the Irish, of far the greater part of the Netherlands, Poland, Bohemia, Germany, Hungary, and the neighboring provinces, and in those kingdoms and States in which it is not the established religion, the Catholics are very numerous, as in Holland, Russia, Turkey, the Lutheran and Calvinistic States of Germany and England. Even in Sweden and Denmark several Catholic congregations are to be found. All the great families of Europe are Roman Catholics, as the Protestants themselves are ready to confess, when they say that as his late majesty, King George III, could not espouse a Roman Catholic, he was precluded from intermarrying in any of the great families of Europe.

Now, Sirs, I hope you do not think that this is all the evidence I can adduce for the Apostolic successors of the Catholic church, my space being limited. I would earnestly request you to inform me when the Apostolic church became extinct, or in what book or document I may find the same, as the four gospels with all the scripture prove the contrary.

I remain, Sirs, your ob't,

CHARLES RAFFERTY

#### STRANG'S LETTER. No 1.

MR. RAFFERTY.—

DEAR SIR:—We shall take up all the important parts of your letter separately, and answer them as truth shall require, each answer immediately following the statement of your position or assertion. We are perfectly aware that the Catholic church is the GIBRALTER

OF CHRISTENDOM, and that with its pretensions fall all the Protestant Churches, because they were derived from it as a common fountain. Unfortunately for the defense of that Gibraltar you use much assertion and little proof.

"St. Peter carried the faith to Rome, at that time the seat of empire," &c., (the church) "having the same visible head, St. Peter, first Pope and Bishop of Rome."

This is mere assertion, to sustain which you have not introduced one word of testimony. It is not merely a question of history, but also of ecclesiastical order, and in both views we shall examine it. It being a mere affirmation of yours, the *onus probandi* rests on you. Still, if you succeed in making good these assertions, you have not progressed one step in sustaining the claims of the bishops of Rome to supremacy. But if these affirmations cannot be proved, there is a full end of the pretensions of the Romanists. The fountain of their pretended authority is dried up, and the stream must be alike dry.

Will Mr. Rafferty please tell us where is the proof that Peter was bishop of Rome? Is it in the scriptures? We think *they* will not prove that he ever visited Rome at all; though it is not improbable that he wore a chain and suffered martyrdom there. It is clear from the scriptures that Peter did not preside over any church in gentile countries till after the council at Jerusalem, A. D. 50. One or two years after that he was at Antioch, Gal. ii. 11, where Paul met him and rebuked him. Long before this the church was planted in Rome. Strangers of Rome received the gospel at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 10. These men must have carried the faith and established the church there on their return. In the year 60, when Paul wrote his epistle to the Ro-

man, that church was famous throughout the world for its faith. Rom. i. 8. Was Peter then its bishop? Assuredly not; for almost the entire sixteenth chapter of that epistle is devoted to personal salutations, and Peter is nowhere mentioned. Surely Paul could not thus pass by the Pope while he saluted so many. Again. In that epistle Paul acts as an *instructor*, a *RULER* set in *AUTHORITY* over the church. What business had Paul at Corinth to send such an epistle to the Metropolitan church, under the personal presidency of Pope Peter? Can the traveling elders in distant countries thus dictate to the church, which is at the city of Rome, under the immediate presidency of the Pope? Paul visited Rome at a late period of his life, A. D. 64 or 65. Acts xxviii. 16. Writing from Rome to Timothy, he says, "*Only LUKE is with me, Take MARK and bring him with thee, for he is profitable to me for the ministry.*" 2 Tim. iv. 11. Consequently Peter was not at Rome at that time, and surely he was not when Paul was brought before Nero, for he tells us, ver. 16, "at my first answer *NO MAN stood with me, but ALL MEN FORSOOK ME*." I pray God that it may not be laid to their charge."

If Peter ever visited Rome at all (which no authentic history shows) it could not have been till about the year 66 or 67, nor till after the date of Paul's epistle to Timothy.

So much for the pretence that Peter *presided* over the church at Rome, or was bishop or Pope of Rome. Now, what is the evidence that PETER was BISHOP at all? Do you hold the office of BISHOP and APOSTLE the same?

We find that Judas Iscariot was a *bishop*. Acts i. 30. He was overseer of the temporal concerns of the Apostles, "and had the bag, and bare what was put therein." John xii. 6. By transgression he fell from his "*bishopric*." Matthias took his place. Acts i. 26.

Nowhere do we find that St. Peter or any other Apostle was a BISHOP. If you assume that all the APOSTLES were BISHOPS by virtue of their APOSTLESHIP, you assume that there were TWELVE BISHOPS at one and the same time. You say "the Apostles established the church of Christ in all the countries of the universe," and "those whom they had chosen to succeed them in the functions of their ministry IMITATED their zeal, and in like manner transmitted to their successors the FAITH intrusted to them, which, by these means, has from age to age been handed down to OUR days in its original purity." Then, of course, you will assert that, according to the "*pure original*" ORDER, there has been twelve Apostles or Bishops at the "*visible head*" of the Catholic church from the days of St. Peter to this day, or frankly give up the point and openly confess you have transgressed the "*pure original*" order that was "*established*" by the first twelve Apostles.

True, Peter received the "keys of the kingdom." Did this constitute him a Bishop, apart from the rest of the Apostles? Why then was Judas Iscariot a Bishop? did he receive the "keys of the kingdom" equal with Peter? if so, where is the proof? Our Lord Jesus Christ told Peter that to him was given power (keys) "to bind on earth and in heaven: to loose on earth and loose in heaven." If twelve Bishops were necessary to bear this authority at one and the same time, it is equally as necessary that twelve Bishops should bear that power or authority in these "our days," in order to keep up a succession in the church in its "original purity." We will press this point until you prove that St. Peter alone, of the twelve Apostles, was Bishop or Pope.

But if we concede to you, what you cannot prove, that Peter was Bishop,

and that he did preside over the church at Rome, you have not yet made the least progress in logically proving that his successors in THE BISHOPRIC are supreme, or in any sense stand at the head of the church. What is the Episcopal office? What PRIESTHOOD, or if you prefer the word, ORDERS does a bishop hold? A LOCAL PRESIDENCY over the church or churches within some jurisdiction. Such I believe is the office of a Bishop in every church where it exists at all, except the American Methodist church, which hardly pretends to Apostolic authority or precedent, either in order or doctrine. Such certainly is the use of the office of BISHOP in the CATHOLIC church; and with this interpretation, if not a still more limited one, agrees the testimony of scripture.

What is the nature of the APOSTOLIC office? What priesthood or authority does an Apostle hold? A general superintendence of the churches and a traveling authority throughout the world. The commission to the Apostle Peter and the rest of the eleven was, Go ye into ALL THE WORLD and preach the gospel to every creature. Mark xvi. 15. Matt. xxviii. 19. Luke xxiv. 47. In fulfilling the duties of this commission they did not in any instance stop with the permanent presidency of one church, as do the bishops of the Roman church in general, and the Pope of Rome in particular. Their lives were spent in traveling from city to city, and from country to country. And though they exercised jurisdiction in ALL the churches, there is not a case on record where any one of them had the particular or local presidency of any

he had ordained in the churches. Peter also wrote two epistles, by way of COMMANDMENTS, 2 Peter iii. 2, to those who were scattered abroad; in each of which he states his authority so to do, not as a Bishop or Pope, but as an Apostle. He is very particular in stating his authority, thus to dictate to the churches. 1 Peter i. 1. 2 Peter i. 1. But he nowhere mentions the PAPAL OFFICE as his authority.

Consequently, if we concede to you that Peter both planted the church at Rome and was its Bishop, you have not gained one step in making out that his successors in THE BISHOPRIC are at the head of the church. And if it be true that the Apostles transmitted to their successors, from age to age till this present time, the faith and order of the church in ITS ORIGINAL PURITY, then the SUCCESSORS of St. Peter as Bishops of Rome (conceding that the Bishops of Rome are his successors) are subject in THIS AGE to the epistolary COMMANDMENTS of the SUCCESSORS of St. PETER and St. PAUL in the APOSTLESHIP. You cannot get over the fact that the church at Rome and its Bishop, Pope or presiding officer, by whatever name you please to call him, was SUBJECT to the APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY of Peter, Paul and the other Apostles, and not supreme. What pertained to the predecessors, both in prerogative and disability, also pertained to the successors.

Peter, as an APOSTLE, held the keys of the kingdom, A. D. 33, Matt. xvi. 19, some two years at least before the church at Rome existed. The exact time of the planting of that church is unknown, but A. D. 66 it was among the most famous churches in the world, and of course must have had a Bishop, Pope or presiding officer. Not till A. D. 66, if ever, did Peter visit Rome. Consequently, if he ever became Bishop of Rome, he, by virtue of that office, held

Paul, as an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ, not as Bishop, sent epistles containing instruction and COMMANDMENTS to seven different churches, besides an occasional commandment to the Bishops

simply the same mission, jurisdiction and prerogatives as HIS PREDECESSORS in that office held, and transmitted the same, and no more, to his successors in the BISHOPRIC: retaining and TRANSMITTING UNIMPAIRED and ENTIRE to his SUCCESSORS IN THE APOSTOLIC OFFICE, the KEYS OF THE KINGDOM and the superior prerogatives and priesthood of the Apostleship, which he held LONG BEFORE HE BECAME BISHOP. From this conclusion you cannot escape. Your hands are made strong and writhing is vain.

If you say the Apostolic office has ceased, as do the Protestants, then upon that saying we will nail you like base coin to the wall, that your worthlessness may be known to all men. If the Apostolic office has ceased, then the Apostles DID NOT "transmit the functions of their ministry" and "the faith entrusted to them" "to their successors," "from age to age" "down to our days." If Apostles have ceased to be in the church, then successors of Apostles have ceased to be: for a successor of an Apostle is an Apostle. It is vain to attempt to confound the office of an Apostle with that of Bishop, for they both existed in the church at the same time, possessed different prerogatives, exercised different jurisdiction, and the BISHOPS were subject to the Apostles. The Apostle Peter, holding the keys of the kingdom while an Apostle, without being Bishop, and Judas at that time being Bishop without holding the keys.

Therefore, it is historically untrue that Peter was 'first Pope and Bishop of Rome,' if he ever held that office at all, of which there is not the remotest probability. And more, it is theologically untrue that Pope Peter was the visible head of the church; for the Apostle Peter was visible head of the church before Rome had Pope, Bishop, or church. And the visible head remains

and continues in the Apostolic, not the Episcopal succession. It is vain to talk of the Apostolic authority of the Bishops or Popes of Rome. Their office is merely Episcopal, not Apostolic. Show us such an officer in the church as PETER was when he received the keys of the kingdom, or you need not talk about a "visible head."

JAMES J. STRANG.

## NO 2.

"To St. Peter alone our blessed Savior said, Thou art Peter, (a rock,) and upon this rock I will build my church, &c. Matt. xvi. 18.

To St. Peter alone our blessed Savior said, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, &c. 19.

To Peter alone our blessed Savior said, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren. Luke xxii. 32. [Luke xxii. 32.]

To Peter our blessed Savior proposed three times the following questions: Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? John xxi. 15, 16, 17; and upon Peter's answer in the affirmative, he tells him twice feed my lambs, and the third time feed my sheep."

We will concede to you, Mr. Rafferty, some truth in this motley combination of assertions. You have certainly proved that a man may speak much truth and come to no result. You have not so much as told us what conclusion you was looking to, but have left us to infer what you sought to prove; and were it not for your subsequent allusion to our statement, that the "ancient Apostolic church has become extinct," no one could suspect that by these affirmations and references you intended to show the indestructibility of the ancient Apostolic church, or its present existence on earth. I am perfectly

aware that the Romanists constantly quote the saying of Christ, "thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," as full and perfect evidence that the church was founded on Peter, and that it should stand during all time; neither of which propositions are contained in it.

Matt. xvi. 13. "When Jesus came into the coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying, Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?"

14. And they said, Some say that thou art John the Baptist; some Elias; and others, Jeremias, or one of the prophets.

15. He said unto them, But whom say ye that I am?

16. And Simon Peter answered, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

17. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

18. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

19. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

Now, had Jesus said, "I will build my church upon you, Peter, or, upon you, whose name is Rock," you might well claim that Peter, the man, not the Apostle, much less the Bishop or Pope, was the foundation of the church; and as truly, that he should never die: for Christ tells us expressly that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it, (the foundation.) If Peter was the foundation, then, according to the promise of Christ, the gates of hell have not pre-

ailed against him and his faith has not failed; HE IS THE FOUNDATION NOW, and all this talk about successors is nonsense.

But Jesus, by one of the most demonstrative terms in language, contradistinguishes Peter from the Rock on which his church is built. His words are, "You are called Rock; and upon this Rock [distinguished from you] I will build my church." The Greek original is still, if possible, more explicit,—*Su ei Petros, kai epi tautes tes Petra*; literally, "Thou art Peter, (Rock,) and upon this the Rock." This demonstrative of something Peter had said, and contradistinguished from him, not only in construction, gender and case, but by a pronoun alluding to what Peter had said—upon this—what you have declared. Had Christ intended to build the church on Peter, his words would have been, "Thou art Peter, (Rock,) and upon that Rock will I build my church."

With this analysis and construction of the language of Christ agrees all scriptural analogy and the fundamental principles of theology. Rock or stone is the proper foundation upon which to erect any building. Now, what is the true foundation of the church?—The REVEALED WORD OF GOD, of which rock, from its imperishability, is a most apt symbol. And by a use as universal as language itself of substituting the producer for the thing produced, all who receive revelations of the word of God for the edification, government, order and doctrine of the church, are called Rocks or stones. In this sense Paul wrote to the Ephesian church, ye "are built upon the foundation of the APOSTLES and PROPHETS, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone" Eph. ii. 20. In like manner Peter not only calls Christ a living stone and a chief corner stone, but others, who received the word, lively stones, a spiritual house

and a holy priesthood. 1 Peter ii. 2, 4, 5, 6 Acts iv. 11. Jacob also prophesied of a "shepherd and stone of Israel," who should arise of the tribe of Joseph in the latter days (Gen. xlix. 24. By which scriptures it appears that not only Peter was a stone, (figuratively, the producer being put for the thing produced,) on which the church was built, but that the holy priesthood, who receive the sincere milk of the word, all the Apostles, all the prophets, and the shepherd who shall lead Israel (when God sets his hand a second time to gather them) as Moses led them in days of old, are in like manner stones in the foundation of the church. And Christ is the chief stone among them; the head of the corner in this foundation. These men are all called stones or rocks in the foundation of the church, not because they are individually a proper support for all the other members of the church, but because they are the revealers or producers of the WORD and AUTHORITY of GOD, on which only the true church is built.

Consequently, when Peter received from God a great and important revelation—the grand fundamental fact of that dispensation—not before known among men—Matt. xvi. 17—that Jesus was "the Messiah, the Son of the living God." Christ replied to him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; my Father who is in heaven hath revealed this to thee: thou art called Peter, and upon this rock (the revelation, not that rock, Peter,) will I build my church."

This interpretation is further sustained by the words that immediately follow—"and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—There is nothing on earth immutable but the law of God. Nought else over which the power of Satan does not prevail. Abraham, the faithful, Moses, who walked with God in the flames; Solomon, whose wisdom

triumphed over the nations, Peter, to whom Christ gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven, all stunned, all died—Even Christ himself, in whom was no sin, stood not against the destroyer. Death, which cometh forth to the gates of hell, prevailed against him. Not till he had gone down to the grave did he obtain the keys of hell and of death. But the word of God standeth forever; against it the gates of hell cannot prevail. It is immutable, unchangeable and eternal. It shall not die.

Such is the foundation which God has laid by the mouth of Apostles and Prophets. On this foundation he has sent the priesthood, from Christ the king, prophet and high priest, after the power of an endless life, down to the youngest deacon, to build his church—And they build thereupon gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, but let them take heed how they build thereon, for their work shall be tried as by fire, and the fire shall reveal it. 1 Cor. iii. 10 to 15.

But this foundation standeth sure, and it shall remain when the creeds of men are forgotten, and the churches that adopted them are numbered with things that were, and are not; when the books that contained them have perished, and the language of their writing is spoken no more, "when the Lord shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God (by revelation, Matt. xi. 27, Luke x. 22.) and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ;" 2 Thes. i. 7, 8 when "the inhabitants of the earth shall be burned and few men left," Isa. xxiv. 6; and they that "have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinances, and broken the everlasting covenant," (v. 3,) by perverting the gospel and making it another, shall "be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord



and the glory of his power;" 2 Thea. i. 9; yea, when 'the heaven shall depart as a scroll when it is rolled together, and every mountain and island shall be moved out of their places;' and the 'great families of Europe into which king George could not marry because they were Catholics,' 'and the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief men, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every freeman shall hide themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; crying to rocks and to mountains, fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb;' Rev. vi. 14, 15, 16; then shall that foundation stand unmoved and unshaken; for it is the word of God and it standeth forever.

JAMES J. STRANG.

#### NO. 2.

"They established a rule of succession for futurity, in order that in each age, at the death of its pastors, their office and ministry might be regularly handed down to others."

"They must be lawfully ordained and sent by the lawful pastors of the church, who have received valid orders and lawful jurisdiction from the lawful successors of the Apostles of Christ."

I repeat these points or assertions in your letter, not so much to controvert what they do contain as to show what essential particulars they are defective in; to the end, that, having ascertained the whole law, we may try the Roman Catholic church by that standard.

I shall agree with you that a rule of succession in the priesthood was established, not by the Apostles alone, but by Prophets and Apostles in all ages, which rule is eternal and immutable, having originated in the decree of God and been in use both during and before the Apostolic age.

And in ascertaining and applying that

rule, I believe all men will agree in subscribing to the following axioms.—

1st. The successor of an Apostle, is an Apostle. The successor of a Prophet, is a Prophet. The successor of a High Priest, is a High Priest. The successor of a King, is a King. The successor of a Bishop, is a Bishop. The successor of an Evangelist, is an Evangelist. The successor of a Deacon, is a Deacon; and in general, that the successor to him who holds any particular priesthood or office, holds the same priesthood or office as the predecessor.

2d. That whatever pertained to the predecessors in any priesthood or office, both in prerogative and disability, pertains also to the successors.

3d. That whatever acts were requisite to confer the priesthood on the predecessors, the SAME ACTS are requisite to CONFER IT on the SUCCESSORS.

4th. That whatever amount and kind of authority was necessary to confer the priesthood on the predecessors, the same is requisite to confer it on the successors, ad infinitum.

I do not intend in this number to take up your distinction between "orders" and "jurisdiction" nor at any time to question the existence of a real difference between priesthood and jurisdiction, though I conceive you have failed altogether of truly stating it; but shall now proceed to ascertain from the scriptures what that rule of succession in the priesthood is.

Heb. v. 4. "No man taketh this honor (the priesthood) unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.

5. So also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high priest but he (the Lord) that said unto him, Thou art my Son, today have I begotten thee," (glorified him, that is, appointed him to the high priesthood.) And,

iii. 2, "Christ was faithful to him that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful," (to him that appointed him.)

John xix. 21, Christ says, "My Father hath SENT me."

Mr. Rafferty will perceive by these scriptures that he stated but half the rule when he said they must be lawfully ordained by the pastors. For as Aaron was called of God by the mouth of Moses, who held as high authority as that to which he had called him, being both Prophet and High Priest, after the order of Melchisedec, so no man lawfully taketh the priesthood unto himself, but he that is called by REVELATION OF GOD, by the mouth of one lawfully in the priesthood and holding as high authority as that to which he calls. Because of this rule Christ was called of God himself, who said unto him, "Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec." It is in accordance with this fact that he says, "My Father hath sent me," and that Paul says of him, "Christ glorified not himself to be made an high priest." And all they that assume to act in the priesthood or to administer any ordinance in the name of God without being called by revelation as was Aaron, (as well as ordained by the hands of those who have the authority,) do what CHRIST himself did not and DARE NOT do.

The reasonableness and truth of this rule will appear by the following illustration:—All officers of the State of Ohio act in the name of the people of the State. By what authority do they thus act? By an authority given by the people. The people of the State must speak to make any man an officer, authorized to act in their name. They must not only speak, but they must speak according to a fixed and known law of their own adoption. And he who assumes to act in any office in their name without being authorized, is a usurper, and liable to punishment. Further: Whatever act of the people is necessary to make one man governor or magistrate the SAME ACT is necessary to

confer the same office on any other man. The first governor receives his office by revelation of the will of the people, as expressed by their votes. Every subsequent governor must receive his office in the same manner.—The first set of magistrates in any town or jurisdiction are elected by the people of their district, and every subsequent magistrate or set of magistrates must be elected in the same manner, or they cannot hold the office. Moreover, the first governor was not only elected to the office, that is, called to it by a revelation of the will of the people, but after being so elected, he was required to take an oath of office; and until he had taken that oath he was not governor. So of every subsequent governor. And every magistrate is in like manner both elected and qualified by an oath. The rule applies equally to successor and predecessor, and no man can hold the office without both an election and an oath of office.

The fact that the first set of magistrates were called and elected by a revelation of the will of the people, and qualified by oath of office, to act in the name of the people as magistrates, does not authorize them to confer the magisterial authority on others, by means of an oath of office alone, who have not been thus elected and chosen by a like revelation of the will of the people. So entirely sacred do nations and communities hold this rule, that if the best man in the nation should, without an election, simply receive the oath of office from some other magistrate and then enter upon the business of trying criminals, though all his official acts might be circumspect and his sentences eminently just, yet he himself would be a criminal by the law, and would subject himself to even severer punishment than the culprits brought before him, for inflicting just punishment on them.

If it be so eminently necessary that those who act in the name of the people

have authority from them and be duly qualified, how much more that those who act in the name of God shall be both truly called and regularly qualified. As a Catholic, you are bound to acknowledge that God has conferred upon the priesthood the power of remitting sins. AS HE confers the power, it must be exercised in HIS NAME. But if the administrator is not authorized to act in his name, then the act is void, and the sins are retained, or rather left unforgiven. And Paul says, no man taketh this authority unto himself but he that is called of God as was Aaron. Aaron was called of God by revelation, for God spoke unto Moses, the prophet, and told him to put Aaron in the priests' office.

The fact that the priesthood were called by revelation of God and ordained by an authority above them, both before and during the Apostolic dispensation, as clearly appears by the Old and New Testaments as the fact that the officers of the several States of the Union are elected by the people and qualified by oath appears by the books of history and law in our nation—and the man who, after reading the scriptures, should assert that anyone could come into the priesthood without both revelation and ordination is equally as blind as he who pretends that he can attain the magisterial authority without both election and oath. Oh fools, and slow of heart to understand the law of God.

That this may more clearly appear, I present a few cases of the conferring of the priesthood as there recorded.

Numbers, xxvii 15, "And Moses spake unto the Lord, saying,

15. Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man over the congregation.

17. Which may go out before them, and which may go in before them, and

which may lead them out, and which may bring them in; that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd.

18. And the Lord said unto Moses, Take thee Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him;

19. And set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation: and give him a charge in their sight.

20. And thou shalt put some of thine honor upon him, that all the congregation of the children of Israel may be obedient.

21. And Moses did as the Lord commanded him: and he took Joshua, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation.

22. And he laid his hands upon him, and gave him a charge, as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses."

Deut. xxxiv. 9, "And Joshua the son of Nun was full of the spirit of wisdom, for Moses had laid his hands upon him: and the children of Israel hearkened unto him, and did as the Lord commanded Moses."

In this account we have both the essential facts in conferring the priesthood clearly stated, to wit: that Joshua was called by revelation, and that he was ordained by the laying on of hands. And, in accordance with the fundamental principle that the less is blessed of the greater, the revelation comes through the mouth of one above him, and one above him lays his hands upon him. Aside from this, I am not aware that any case of ordination by laying on of hands is specifically recorded in the Old Testament. But it is filled with cases of persons called by revelation. Yet the fact oftener recorded is least believed.

Acts xiii. 1, "Now there were in the church that was at Antioch, certain prophets and teachers; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and

Luctus of Cyrene, and Mameus, which had been brought up with Heron the tetrarch, and Saul.

2. As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul, for the work whereunto I have called them.

3. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away.

4. So they being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed unto Seleucia; and from thence they sailed to Cyprus."

Again, in this case, we have a record of the two essential acts for conferring the priesthood, both being performed upon Barnabas and Saul. First, the Holy Ghost said to the prophets and teachers, or some of them, set apart Barnabas and Saul to the work whereunto I have called them, and immediately they ordained them by the laying on of their hands. Consequently they were not said to be sent by the Holy Ghost, because the pastors at Antioch laid their hands on them, as you represent, but because the Holy Ghost sent them by that revelation which he gave when he said "set apart Saul and Barnabas." &c.

Paul, in writing to Timothy, says, iv. 14, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," or (assembly of the priesthood.)

Timothy received the laying on of hands of the presbytery, assembly or council, because, having been called by prophecy, that act was necessary still to bring him into the priesthood. Saul and Barnabas were ordained by the hands of prophets and teachers, because the Holy Ghost had already called them. Joshua was ordained by the hands of Moses, because he was called of God to be the leader, chief captain, judge, or prophet

of Israel. I might add authorities on this subject. But these are abundantly sufficient to show that a call by revelation and an ordination by the hands are both equally necessary to the possession of the priesthood. And consequently, all who act in the priesthood without being so called and so ordained are "THIEVES and ROGUES."

Having thus established the rule that no man has lawful right to the priesthood who is not called of God by revelation, I beg of you to inform me whether his holiness the Pope of Rome was so-called? Did he obtain his office by revelation of God, or by election of the Cardinals? By the way, as the less is blessed of the greater, will you please tell me who ordained him? Of course it was some person who holds as high a PRIESTHOOD as he; for it is difficult to believe that so respectable a people as the Catholic church would, like the Methodists, pretend that a man could ordain others above himself.

Come, Mr. Rafferty, tell us by what prophet God called the present Pope to his priesthood, and by what priest, holding equal or higher authority, he was ordained; for as we have a high opinion of him personally, and as a politician, we should not like to call him either thief or robber, as Christ does those that come not in at the door. The Bible being the standard, this is the only door into the priesthood; and you apply Christ's epithets to all who exercise the priesthood without authority. You must not flinch when they rebound to your own face. And when all these questions are settled I wish you to answer me further, whether the Catholic Bishops and clergy do not generally obtain their priesthood by revelation of the will of some prince or rich man, rather than of God.

These facts and considerations, Mr. Rafferty, will induce reasonable and

considerate men to ask the following questions: Are the Romanist clergy called by revelation of God? If they are, by the mouth of what prophets? Are they ordained by the hands of those who themselves hold the priesthood? If so, who ordains the Pope, of whom there can be but ONE at a time, and consequently who has no superior or equal in the priesthood? Finally, what authority, officer or priesthood is visible head of the church from the death of one Pope to the election of another? Does so large a body as the Holy Catholic Apostolic church continue to live during frequent and sometimes long interregnums without a head? Then let men cease to wonder at its diseases.

JAMES J. STRANG.

#### No. 4.

"The Apostles established the church of Christ in all the countries in the universe, and sealed with their blood the truths they taught."

"In like manner the Apostles sent others to succeed them."

"Those whom they had chosen to succeed them in the functions of their ministry imitated their zeal, and, in like manner, transmitted to their successors the faith intrusted to them, which, by these means, has from age to age been handed down to our days in its original purity."

(The church) "having the same invisible head, Jesus Christ, and the same visible head, St. Peter, first Pope and Bishop of Rome."

If I understand this language, Mr. Rafferty, especially taking it in connection with what you have said of the power conferred on "PETER alone," you hold that Peter was not the successor of Christ in his ministry and priesthood, but a viceregent to him; that Christ is at all times the invisible

head of the church, but that Peter, during his episcopate, and the successors of Peter in the episcopate are the visible head of the church.

"Now, what am I to understand by these words,—'Those WHOM THEY HAD CHOSEN TO SUCCEED them in the functions of their ministry, IN LIKE MANNER, transmitted to their successors the faith intrusted to them?'" In like manner to what manner or act? In the same manner that was used in conferring it on them? In like manner to that which was used in giving them their ministry? I cannot understand your language otherwise. Then how should any one be made Pope, viceregent of Christ, and visible head of the church? In like manner as Peter was. I give this in your own words:

"To St. Peter alone our blessed Savior said, Thou art Peter, (a rock,) and upon this rock I will build my church, &c. Matt. xvi. 18.

"To St. Peter alone our blessed Savior said, I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, &c. Matt. xvi. 19.

"To Peter alone our blessed Savior said, I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren. Luke xxii. 32. [Luke xxii. 32.]

"To Peter our blessed Savior proposed three times the following questions: Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? John xxi. 13, 16, 17, and upon Peter's answer in the affirmative he tells him twice feed my lambs, and the third time feed my sheep."

Is this the manner that men are made Popes in these days? No. Then the functions of their ministry are not transmitted to them "in like manner," as they were received by the Apostles. That a just comparison may be made of the mode of conferring the "keys of the kingdom" on Peter and on the Popes of Rome, I extract from Goodrich's "reli-

gious ceremonies and customs," page 261:

"Policy exerts all her arts, and sets every spring in motion, at the election of a pope; nor do the electors always wait for the death of the present chief or head of the church, to begin those cabals and intrigues which are proper for advancing him whom they esteem a fit person to succeed to the pontifical throne; and although the college (of Cardinals) invariably and unanimously invoke the assistance and aid of the Holy Ghost, to direct them in the choice of a Vicar of Jesus Christ, yet their eminences use all the precaution imaginable to prevent him from being in any way concerned in the election. The cardinals are obliged to enter the conclave ten days after the death of the pope; but before that time they hear the Mass of the Holy Ghost in the Gregorian Chapel, and some bishop makes a Latin harangue, exhorting them to make choice of a person who is worthy to fill the chair of the prince of the apostles. After this their eminences march in procession to the conclave two by two according to their rank, attended by the Swiss Guards and a vast crowd of people, the chorus all the while singing the "Veni Creator." Being arrived at the conclave, they take possession of their cells by lot, after which they go to the Paulin Chapel, where the bulls for the election of the pope are read, and the dean of the sacred college exhorts the assembly to act in conformity to them. When this is over the cardinals are allowed to go home to dine, but must return to the conclave before three at night; at which time the master of the ceremonies acquaints them that they ought not to shut themselves up, unless they are determined to continue there as long as the conclave shall last, consistently with the order and direction of the bulls, in which it is regulated that those who go

out shall not be permitted to return. The governor and marshal of the conclave now post their soldiers in such order and in such places as they judge most requisite for the safety of the election. The ambassadors of princes, and those who have any interest in the election of a future pope, are allowed to continue in the conclave for the first twenty-four hours. When the clock strikes three the master of ceremonies rings a bell, after which all, except the electors, retire; the doors are then shut, the conclave is walled up, and guards are posted at all the avenues. The cardinal-dean and cardinal-camerlengo, now visit the conclave to see if it be well shut, and an act thereof is drawn up by an apostolical notary.

"None but the cardinals, and two conclavists for each, (one an ecclesiastic, and the other a soldier), remain in the conclave. Those cardinals who are princes, or who are old, or infirm, are sometimes allowed three. The other persons appointed for the service of the conclave are the sacristan, the under-sacristan, a secretary, an under-secretary, a confessor, who is always a Jesuit, two physicians, a surgeon, two barbers, an apothecary, and their apprentices, five masters of the ceremonies, a bricklayer, a carpenter, and sixteen porters or valets for hard labor.

"Though the office of a conclavist be inconvenient and uneasy, yet on account of privileges it is very much sought after: for a conclavist is sometimes the secret agent of the ministers of crowned heads. Every officer, however, of the conclave, takes an oath not to reveal any of its secrets.

"According to the order of Innocent III, there are three several methods of electing a pope, viz. by scrutiny, compromise, and inspiration. The election by scrutiny, which is the only way that has been used for a long while, contains all

the formality that appears most essential for making the election canonical. Still it is no more than a mere ceremony, as the several factions of the cardinals have united beforehand in the choice of the person. This harmony is brought about by the most refined and delicate strokes of policy, and for the most part comes on after their emineences have found out, by several scrutineers, the disposition of the sacred college. Then, if the votes for any of the candidates come near the number required, it is a very common practice for the other factions to fall off and condescend with the others, and thereby contribute to the pope's election, fearing to draw on them his hatred by a fruitless and unseasonable opposition.

"The scrutiny consists in collecting and examining votes, given in by printed billets, which the cardinals put into a chalice that stands on the altar of the chapel, at which they have met to choose the pope. These billets are prepared by the masters of the ceremonies, who put them into two golden basins, placed at each end of a long table, which stands on the side of the high altar. Before the scrutiny begins, little bills, having the names of all the cardinals on them, are put into a bag, with an intent to draw thence three scrutineers, three overseers of the sick, and three revisors.

"The cardinals use all the art imaginable to disguise their hands. Or, if they have not skill enough to conceal their hands they make use of an unknown hand, that it may not be known for whom they vote.

"If there be a greater or less number of billets than there are cardinals, the scrutineer burns all he finds in the two chalices, and each cardinal makes a new one, till the scrutiny comes right. When the billets are equal to the number of cardinals, the scrutiny is published. Meanwhile, the cardinals mark

each name upon a sheet of paper, on which all their names are printed. Those who are named set down also the votes given them, to see if they have a sufficient number to be elected. This number must be at least two thirds.

"If the votes do not rise to a sufficient number, billets are taken in order to choose the pope by way of accessus; and there is scarcely ever a scrutiny without this accessus. The accessus is intended to correct the scrutiny. In this, they give their votes by other billets, on which is written, "*Accedo Domino*," &c., when they join their vote to another's; or, "*Accedo Nemini*," when they adhere to their first vote. The accessus is performed in the same manner as the scrutiny; only they do not take the oath again. The scrutineers examine the billets of the accessus, as they did those of the scrutiny, and the cardinals, after the same manner, set down the votes which are gained thereby to any of the candidates.

"After the revisors have very accurately examined the votes of the accessus, and find the election to be perfectly canonical, they send for three apostolical notaries into the chapel where the election was made, who, upon inspecting the billets and other pieces which the scrutineers and revisors lay before them, draw up a memorandum of the election. All the cardinals who have assisted at the conclave, sign and seal this record: after which, the scrutineers burn all the billets, both of the scrutiny and the accessus, in presence of all the cardinals.

"The pope is elected by compromise, when the cardinals, disagreeing in their choice, engage by mutual compromise to refer the election to some particular cardinal of probity, and to acknowledge him whom they shall nominate as duly elected, by virtue of the power given to them for that purpose. The election by way of inspiration is in some

measure riotous and tumultuary. A select number of cardinals of different factions, who have determined to put every thing to the last push, begin to cry out, "such a one is pope," as it were by inspiration. Adoration is the same as inspiration, which is, when two thirds of the conclave, being agreed in the person go in a body and adore and acknowledge the pope they approve of, as head of the church. The elections by way of compromise, inspiration, and adoration, but seldom happen. The scrutiny and accessions are the methods generally observed."

I have not been able to learn that the Pope receives any ordination at all, except as Bishop or ordinary. If you can see any **LIKENESS** in such a "manner," to that which Christ used in conferring the keys of the kingdom on Peter and making him "visible head," I for one cannot.

Your distinction between priesthood and jurisdiction will not help you out of this difficulty. If Peter, when he received "the keys" of the kingdom, received no new priesthood, but only a new jurisdiction, yet he received it by the word of Christ who first stood at the head on earth, and afterwards in heaven. If, as the first viceregent, Peter received his viceregency or pontificate from Christ himself, so each subsequent one must receive his viceregency or pontificate from the same source, or there is no likeness. The present Pope of Rome did not receive the keys from his predecessor, for his predecessor was dead before his election. He did not receive them from the college of cardinals, for as they were not possessed of the keys during the pontificate of the preceding Pope, it is not conceivable that without any act whatever, but the death of an individual, they became *ipso facto* possessed of them. And if he did receive them by any such means, there would be no

likeness between that and the mode in which Peter received them. There is no likeness unless he receives them as Peter did from Christ himself. When the king of Spain established Vice Royal government in the Indies, he not only established the fundamental laws and appointed a Vice Roy with power to make such additional laws as should be necessary, but he himself appoints all the subsequent Vice Roes in the same manner and by the same solemnities as those used in the first instance.—So you claim that the Roman hierarchy receives the "functions of their ministry" (whether you designate it as orders or jurisdiction) in the same manner as their predecessors in the beginning received theirs. If you can see any likeness in the mode now adopted in that church and the mode used for conferring the keys on Peter, as you have described it, I think few others can. Such a thing as a Vice Roy appointing his successor of his own motion is not known, much less of his being appointed by the princes and great men of his dominion without waiting for the will of the king under whom he holds jurisdiction.

To make Peter head of the church you conclude that Christ, by the peculiar language he used to him alone, gave him power that no other Apostle possessed. Then to make the Bishops of Rome his successors you assume that he was Bishop of Rome. Then you assume that the keys of the kingdom pertain to the Bishopric, which he did not hold till long after; and not to the other Bishoprics.—Then you assume that Bishops are successors of Apostles. Then that an ordination to any other Bishopric is all that is necessary to hold the keys, so the incumbent has his call by revelation, not from Christ, but from the cardinals, most of whom are not even Bishops, but only priests, deacons, &c.



In this manner you have blotted out all the fundamental principles of priesthood as acknowledged and practiced in the days of Christ and the Apostles. An election by equals and inferiors answers to a call by revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ. An ordination by the hands of Bishops who were subject to the Apostles, is all that is necessary to fill the chair of the prince of Apostles, and to preside over not only Bishops, but Arch-Bishops and Patriarchs.—Thus have you blotted out both a call by revelation and the law that the less is ordained of the greater.

I have sought in this article, as much as possible, to avoid all allusion to the abuses of the Roman Catholic system, because I well know that the abuses of a true system do not make it untrue. Consequently I have altogether discarded the common accusations against the Romanists. Without alluding to the purchase and sale of Bishoprics, even where that purchase and sale is publicly made by the highest functionaries in the church, I have put the matter to the test of the THEORY of the Roman Catholic church, as compared to RULE contained in the scriptures. Can you see any likeness?—Will you now say that the Catholic clergy receive the functions of their ministry in the same manner as the Apostles and their immediate successors received theirs?

I cannot well avoid calling your attention to the manner used in a former dispensation. Moses stood at the head of a former dispensation, in which priesthood was conferred by the same immutable law, to wit: revelation and the laying on of hands. But the great end of the dispensation, the establishment of Israel as a NATION OF PRIESTS and a holy people unto God in that rest which Abraham and many of the faithful looked for, having failed by the disobedience and idolatry of the Israelites, especially in the matter of the golden

calf; when Moses was taken away, but a part of his priesthood or authority was left. Consequently, before his dissolution and in anticipation of that event, Joshua was called by the voice of God and ordained by the hand of Moses to a subordinate station, that he might be the leader of that people, a prophet, a priest or sacrificator, and a captain of the Lord's host. Num. xxi. 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20. You will readily perceive that if Joshua had been called to the same authority as Moses, Moses could not have ordained him, because Moses held a sole priesthood in which he could have no fellow or equal. Like the Pope, there could be but one at the same time. But as he came in to a subordinate priesthood, Moses conferred it upon him, that, during his life, he might exercise it in subjection to him, and after his death exercise the same power and no more, in the same station; the superior priesthood which Moses held not being continued on the earth at all.

But the priesthood which Moses conferred on Joshua did continue through many generations, and as that also was held by a single individual who went before all the congregation of Israel and the princes and heads of tribes, and before the high priests, the sons of Aaron; that is, stood above them in priesthood and jurisdiction, as the Romanists claim that the Pope does above kings and princes, Bishops, Arch-Bishops and Patriarchs; it would seem that the manner of appointing the Pope should be somewhat like that used in appointing the Prophet-Judge and Captain of Israel. The appointment of Peter to hold the keys of the kingdom, &c., as subordinate to Christ, and not as successor to him, (for I think you so hold it,) corresponds sufficiently. But where is the likeness between the appointment of the Popes of Rome, as successors of Peter, and the Prophet-Judges of Israel,

as successors to Joshua? When Eli, the Judge, suffered unrighteousness and oppression to go unpunished and undressed, the Lord God SPOKE to Eli and put him out of the Judge's office, and denounced judgments against him for his wickedness; and at the same time spoke to Samuel, and put him into the Judge's office. Eli, who was removed from the priesthood, could not put Samuel in; but the Lord put him in; and made Eli a witness of it, so that Eli said "It is the Lord," and voluntarily yielded up his power to Samuel, a mere child, so that from that time forward all Israel obeyed him. 1 Samuel iii.

Afterwards when Elijah, filling the same office and priesthood which had belonged to both Joshua, Eli, Samuel and many others, by his righteousness prevailed with God to be translated to heaven, it was not till he was taken up from the earth that he could confer it upon Elisha, his successor. It could not be even that he should confer it on him the same day of his ascension before he went up, but it was necessary that Elisha should be with him WHEN he went up, that after he entered the chariot of the Lord and ceased to remain on earth he might as a minister of heaven, confer on him a priesthood or jurisdiction that belongs to but one individual on earth at the same time 2 Kings ii. Many have supposed that Elisha became prophet instead by the anointing of Elijah. 1 Kings xix. 16.—But this is a most obvious error; because Elijah continued in his own place a long time after that anointing. At the taking of Elijah Elisha asked a double portion of his spirit, and not till after he got it was a prophet in Elijah's stead. This more clearly appears from the further fact that Hazael was at the same time anointed to be king over Syria, and Jehu to be king over Israel. 1 Kings xix. 15, 16, 17. Yet Hazael did not become king even in the mind of the Lord,

by whose word he was anointed, till years passed away. For many years after that the prophet Elisha said to him, "the Lord hath shown me that thou shalt be king over Syria." 2 Kings viii. 16. And Jehu, too, though anointed to be king, had to be anointed king afterwards before he could fill the throne of Israel. 2 Kings ix. 1 to 6.

These few facts make a clear rule in that dispensation that the superior priesthood which was not after the order of Aaron, but after the order of Melchisedec; the same order of priesthood which Christ held, and of which he made the apostles partakers; which Peter calls a ROYAL PRIESTHOOD, because it holds the governing power; which the Popes claim, as his successors; and by virtue of which they claim the right to make and dethrone kings as did those Prophet-Judges; could be received only by revelation of God; that by that means the succession was kept up in that dispensation. The history of that dispensation also shows that the apostasy of that people consisted in their setting up a different set of authorities, called not by revelation of the will of God, but the will of the people, or of some faction. I confess that the conferring of the priesthood or jurisdiction on the Roman Catholic hierarchy looks to me much more like the assumption of power during the apostasy of Israel, than the conferring of the true priesthood, either in the Mosaic or Apostolic dispensation.

JAMES J. STRANG.

#### NO. 3.

"They established a rule of succession for futurity in order that in each age, at the death of its pastors, their office and ministry might be regularly handed down to others."

There is no array of the officers and ministry of the christian church, contained in the scriptures. Consequently,

should I find any officers or ministers in the Roman Catholic church not mentioned in the scriptures. I should not insist on that as being clearly error, but would allow the validity of tradition and church practice from the earliest authentic history, provided the succession in that ministry was properly kept up.

But if there be an essential and important branch of the ministry, a superior priesthood and jurisdiction in the church, the use and necessity of which clearly appears by the scripture, in which you are totally defective, and have been from age to age, I humbly submit that such a deficiency would be fatal to the claims of your church, as it would most certainly to the soundness of your argument.

In the hierarchy of the christian church were first apostles, second prophets, then evangelists, pastors, teachers, &c.

1 Cor. xii. 28, 'God hath set some in the church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers,' &c.

Eph. iv. 11, "And he (Christ) gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers;

13. For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ:

13. Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ;

14. That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive;

15. But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ,

16. From whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."

As this ministry or priesthood was set in the church for the perfecting of the saints, and that we be no more tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine and by the cunning and craftiness of men, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; and as this was done by an all-wise God who is abundantly able to use the means best adapted to the end, it follows that without such a ministry the end will not be accomplished, but that we henceforward shall be tossed to and fro as children with every wind of doctrine, and shall be deceived by the craftiness of men, whereby we shall MAKE SHIPWRECK OF FAITH instead of being fitly joined together into a PERFECT BODY of which the SON of GOD is HEAD, having unity of faith, knowledge of God, and perfection.

The hierarchy of the Roman Catholic church consists of bishops, priests and deacons. With these may be reckoned also a kind of inferior priesthood, consisting of the acolyte, exorcist, lector and porter. The office or priesthood of bishop is also divided into several dignities or degrees of spiritual jurisdiction, as ordinaries, (commonly called bishops,) archbishops, primates, patriarchs and the pope. On this subject I quote from a standard Romanist work, "The Poor Man's Catechism, by John Manneck, O. S. B. Baltimore, Metropolitan press, page 391—2—3—4:—

'Q. WHAT is Holy Order? A. A sacrament by which power is given to the ministers of the church, to do their holy offices, and also grace to do them well.  
Q. To whom is this sacrament given?  
A. To such, chiefly, as are made bishops and priests, whose duty it is to conduct the faithful to eternal life; there

are, also, inferior degrees of holy orders, as that of deacon and sub-deacon.

"INSTRUCTION. Holy Order is a sacrament, which God has ordained to the well-governing his church. Christ being our high priest, from his person, all spiritual power must be derived; this he gave to the first apostles, and instituted the sacrament of Holy Order, by which they ordained bishops and priests to succeed themselves in the government of souls; and no one has power to do those holy offices, which concern the honor of God and salvation of souls, but such only as are lawfully ordained by this sacrament, by the hands of those who were lawfully ordained before them. Although a man is elected by the magistrates and all the people, he has no power to administer the sacraments, and to preach, unless he is ordained by a Bishop. As in baptism we are made christians, to follow the life of Christ; in confirmation, soldiers of Christ, to defend his faith; so, by holy order, we are made ministers of Christ, to dispense his sacred mysteries to his people; and as such, we receive God's mark in these three sacraments, which is a spiritual character in the soul, and is indelible, to remain forever, to the glory or confusion of those who have received it.

"The apostles administered this sacrament in the very infancy of the church; as when they ordained St. Paul and Barnaby at Antioch, with the sacred ceremony of imposition of hands. Acts xiv.—And St. Paul afterwards ordained Timothy bishop of Ephesus, with the like ceremony, as his own words bear witness: Neglect not the grace which is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the imposition of the hands of the priesthood. 1 Tim iv. 14. I admonish thee that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of my hands. 2 Tim i 6.

"In Holy Order there are seven degrees, by which we ascend to the priesthood, four less, and three greater. Con. Carthag. 4. c. 8. Of the less, the first is that of Porter, whose office is to keep the keys of the church, sacristy, treasury, and to keep all out of the church and sanctuary who ought not to enter: to him the bishop says, in his ordination, So behave yourself as to give an account to God of what is kept under your charge. 2. That of Lector; his office is to read aloud the lessons of the Old and New Testament, which belong to the divine office, and to instruct the ignorant in the rudiments of the christian religion, the bishop gives him a book, containing those things, and charges him faithfully and profitably to fulfill his office. 3. That of Exorcist, to him is given power to exorcise possessed persons: the bishop gives a book of exorcisms, and bids him receive it with power to lay his hands on such as are possessed, whether baptized or catechumens. 4. That of Acolyte; his office is to assist the deacon and sub-deacon at the altar; to carry the lights, to prepare the wine and water for consecration, and attend on the divine mysteries; the bishop gives him a wax candle, with two little cruets, bidding him light the candle, and serve wine and water in the cruets. By these less we ascend to the greater. The first of these is the order of Sub-deacon: he serves the deacon at the altar; prepares the altar, the chalice, the bread, and the wine, he reads the epistle aloud at high Mass; the bishop, before he ordains him, declares that none are to receive this order, but those who will observe perpetual continency from marriage: he then gives him a chalice, and paten, basin and towel, and two little cruets, the book of epistles; bids him Consider his ministry, and behave so as to please God. The second of the greater orders is that of Deacon; his office is immediately to assist the

bishop or priest at high Mass, and the administration of the sacraments. He reads the Gospel aloud at Mass; he gives the cup, when the sacrament of the Eucharist is given in both kinds, he may give baptism, and preach the Gospel, by commission. To him the bishop gives a book of the Gospels, with power to read it in the Church of God. The third is that of priesthood, which has two degrees of power and dignity: that of bishops, and that of priests. The office of a priest is to consecrate and offer the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, under the form of bread and wine, to administer all the sacraments, except confirmation and holy order, to preach the Gospel, to bless the people, and to conduct them in the way to life eternal; as also to bless such things as are not reserved to the benediction of the bishop. The bishop, when he ordains a priest, anoints his hands with oil, which signifies the grace that is conferred upon him; he gives him the paten with bread upon it, and a chalice with wine, with power to offer sacrifice for the living and the dead, then he lays his hands upon him and says, Receive the Holy Ghost, &c., with several other ceremonies. The office of a bishop is to govern the Church, both clergy and laity, in his respective diocese; to inflict censures, excommunication, suspension, &c., to offer sacrifice, to preach the Gospel, to give confirmation and holy order; none but bishops receive this sacrament in full, so as to have power to administer all the sacraments. Of these degrees of holy order, only bishops, priests and deacons constitute the hierarchy of the Church, which is of divine institution. Conc. Trent. Sess. 23. c. 6. But, as there are several degrees in order, so there are higher and lower degrees of dignity and spiritual jurisdiction in the episcopacy itself. 1. That of ordinaries. 2. That of archbishops. 3. That of primates. 4. That of

patriarchs. 5. That of the supreme head, and common father of all, the pope, who holds his supremacy, as successor to St. Peter, by right divine."

Here, sir, is an entire lack of the most important ministry and priesthood of the christian church. You have neither Apostles or Prophets. And you are not only destitute of this ministry, but you have no substitute for it. It will not do to say your Bishops are a substitute for the office of Apostles, for the Apostles were some of them Prophets, Seers, and Revelators, and all were witnesses of Christ and ambassadors from him to the nations, which your Bishops none of them profess to be. The Bishops are in no sense in place of the Apostles, for many of the functions of the Apostolic office the church authoritatively disclaims possession of.

And as it is a well known fact that Bishops existed in the church during the time of the Apostles, and that they held an inferior ministry and were subject to the Apostles, it is foolish to pretend that they are successors to them. And the Bishop being the highest priesthood in the Roman church, it would seem that this fact alone made a full end of their pretensions.

But where do you pretend to find a substitute for Prophets? Who in your church, either with or without being Bishops, hold this priesthood? What Prophet among you stood up in the name of God to tell you of the recent famine in Ireland, which has swept off untold thousands of the faithful in that country, as Agabus of old told the saints in his time of the famine in the days of Claudius Cæsar? Who of your priesthood could, by the spirit of God, perceive the coming danger and warn them of the true refuge? Aye, who knows now whether that famine was sent as a scourge on the Catholics of Ireland, or on their enemies? Upon them alike has it fallen. It is not

improbable that the population of the whole kingdom is decimated. The grave has yawned till cities are desolate. The starved skeletons of the Catholic and Protestant alike wander over the land, whose miseries are but begun. The Catholic and Protestant clergy alike chant anthems to the same God, that the feast of death is suspended, which they fondly and falsely hope will not begin again. But among them all is not found the Seer who can tell against whom the wrath of God is waxed hot, or why he thus chastises the creatures of his hand. Among all their clergy was raised no warning voice beforehand to tell them of the coming calamity; to admonish them of the law of God forgotten, or point out a refuge to the penitent and obedient. No, the word of God was not among them, and they perished, and knew not why and had no refuge. Their shepherds are as dogs without mouths, that could neither bark to warn the flock of invasion or bite the destroyer among them. They are as men who have no God, and they perished as the heathen and knew not why.

And as they made shipwreck of life then and there for want of Apostles and prophets, so have they elsewhere and at other times, and so also have they made shipwreck of faith. For want of the word and authority of God that church is no nearer perfected now than hundreds of years ago. It has no more come to the unity of the faith; its body is no more edified, and it has not progressed one step in BRINGING IN THE REST of God which he has RESERVED to his PEOPLE; taking away ALL CURSE and ESTABLISHING EVERLASTING RIGHTNESS.

That church has existed more than one thousand years with its present organization and priesthood. During all that time, except one or two short interregnums, she has been an empire

of herself. — And she has exerted a power above princes, kings and potentates throughout nearly half the earth. And looking back through the vista of time in the light of history I cannot discover one single act of her doing which should help to bring about that state of things that the Prophets looked for, and patriarchs and priests of old died in the faith of.

JAMES J. STRANG.

NOTE.—The foregoing discussion between Mr. Strang and Mr. Rafferty was carried on through the columns of the *Voice Herald* or *Reverie*, and appeared weekly in said columns. Mr. Strang's able handling of the Catholic claim to priesthood makes a full end of that claim; and as she is the oldest—the mother of all the Christian sects, with her claim falls the claim of all the Christian sects to a succession of priesthood, or authority to administer the ordinances of the Church of Jesus Christ, organized by him and his apostles on the earth.

We would especially call the attention of the leaders of both Brighamite and Joseph churches to the above discussion, and ask them whether their churches were built according to the scriptural or revealed pattern, or is only another type of the Catholic church in their organization or foundation.

Says the Reorganized Leader, "Whatever God commands man to do, the command carries with it the authority to do the thing commanded to be done." (See *Saints' Herald* May 31, 1862, page 497.)

To this it is very proper to say that it states only half the truth, and therefore tells us only a very gross and misleading falsehood. For does God Almighty give commandments and revelations to every man who assumes to be a revelator and commander to his people, or

does he call and *ordain* man to that authority? And will those who follow unauthorized commanders and revelators be deceived? (Doc. and Cov. Sec. 43:2.)

In harmony with this Joseph the Seer says: "We do not consider ourselves bound to receive any revelation from any one man or woman, without their being legally constituted and ORDAINED to that authority and given sufficient proof of it." (TIMES AND SEASONS, Vol. 5, page 732.)

But of course the Reorganized excuse is, and was, that the church had gone wrong, and this and that and the other needed righting, etc. This is the same excuse exactly that every single church organizer from Martin Luther to the last Free Methodist reformer or the great John Alex. Dowie has had to offer for their great reformatory movements, and so there is no end to church reformers; but God's order still stands, and is ever the same, from age to age, and the manner of conferring his authority changes not. Brigham Young and his right hand men did mislead the great body of the church organized through Joseph the Seer astray. But that did not prevent the God of Israel from fulfilling to the letter the oath which he made to the church in an early day, saying: "I have given him (Joseph) the keys of the MYSTERIES and the revelations which are sealed UNTIL I shall appoint unto them (the church) another in his stead." This appointment was promptly made, through Joseph, by appointing Mr. Strang a few days before his martyrdom; by revelation from God, and God's sending a holy angel unto Mr. Strang to ordain him, as Joseph himself was ordained, at the moment of Joseph's death, as the Almighty told the church before, and the church in this appointment were told where to go for safety from the perils they were then in; and at the proper time the church was reorganized and in

regular running order under Mr. Strang, and the wicked and usurping leaders at Nauvoo were disciplined and cut off and others called and ordained to fill their places, and there was therefore absolutely no use or need for another or second reorganization gotten up by E. C. Briggs, Zenas H. Gurley, or anybody else. If these men had been led, or inspired by the Almighty, they would have been led to Mr. Strang, and the church organized under him, exactly as Cornelius and Paul were led to the true church and its legally constituted officers, instead of being led to build up another church without one ray of truth to base their authority for so doing upon. God neither calls, nor in any way leads men to organize or build up a church at enmity with his own lawfully and justly organized church and kingdom. As well expect that God would call out and command a Corah, Dathan and Abiram, to build up and organize a church independent and at war with the church under Moses. Different attempts to so organize have been made at different times under Moses, but they all came ignominiously to grief in that attempt, and these things were written for our learning or admonition lest we be found in like idoltries and rebellions against God. Why should not the Almighty "command" a Cornelius or Paul to go to work and get up a reorganization, as to send to Joppa sixty miles after a Peter, that is, the Strang of that period? Why not tell a Simon Magus, or an "Alexander the Coppernith," or an "Elymas the Sorcerer," and various other opposers of the church and power of God to go and organize and build up a church and undertake to ordain all its officers from the deacon to the president and seer of the church, and to entirely ignore and disregard his own lawfully organized church, with its lawfully constituted and ordained officers. Foolish,

ridiculous and outrageously wicked as such a thing would be, yet that is the very work which the founders of the Reorganization entered upon when they undertook to get up the Reorganized church!

I have not room here but for a few more remarks. "I have given him (Joseph) the keys of the mysteries and the revelations, which are sealed, UNTIL I shall appoint unto them another in his stead." (Doc. and Cov., Sec. 27 & 2.) This language strongly implies that when the appointment of a successor was made that Joseph would cease to act longer as a prophet and seer to the church; and as strongly implies that the person appointed would immediately enter upon the duties and prerogatives of that office. Taking the letter of appointment by Mr. Strang (July 8th, 1844), the death of Joseph Smith on the 27th day of June, and Mr. Strang's ordination by the angel at the very moment of Joseph's death leaves positively nothing wanting to the complete fulfillment of the above words, or promise of God, to the very letter. And now apply the above words to either the claim of Brigham Young or young Joseph, and one is positively astounded to think that either of them should ever claim that they were ever fulfilled in his case. In young Joseph's case especially, if the young Josephite leaders had been trying for fifty years to put his claims out of harmony with the promise of God, they could not have succeeded one whit better than they have in the set-

ting up of young Joseph Smith's claims. As for Brigham Young's impudent and heaven-daring decree: "Let no man presume for a moment that Joseph's place will be filled by another," in the face of three of the most solemn promises of God that he would plant another in Joseph's stead; that puts an end to his claims as the one appointed to fill that place; for if he was appointed, he never could have made that decree. And there is no argument that either of these two men can make in defense of his claim to succeed the prophet and seer, but leaves them four times worse off than if they had said nothing. The word of God is everywhere against them. They are begged deeper and deeper in the mire every turn and twist they make. They stand a good deal as one caught in the act of a theft or robbery; to defend is only to make their guilt the more self-evident. Their utter lack of the prophetic keys and gifts for now over forty years is another sledge-hammer blow to their pretensions, and shows that their claims have been founded in fraud from the very beginning. For the keys of MYSTERIES and revelations ALWAYS ACCOMPANY the office held by Joseph Smith, which made him a prophet, SEER, revelator and TRANSLATOR. "Like unto Moses, holding ALL the gifts which God bestows upon the head of the church." (Doc. & Cov., Sec. 89: 3. Sec. 90: 1. Sec. 105: 42, 2nd Book of Nephi, chap. 5, par. 47.)

Truly,

WINGFIELD WATSON.

Lyons, Wisconsin, May 26, 1908

30-18 m East  
Salt Lake City  
Cec. McFarland